

The woman was his wife. Richard Henry of GOAL has been harassed by the police, as has his brother Milton Henry.

The Civil Rights Commission, the Commission on Community Relations and the Police Community Relations Bureau--agencies which are supposed to have jurisdiction in these matters--are totally ineffective in dealing with the problem. The Civil Rights Commission, in particular, has the most power and has been the biggest disappointment. It is still "investigating" cases which occurred in February of 1964. *from whom?* It is known that its investigations have been stopped on occasion by political pressure. Furthermore, as evidence of its failure to make deep-seated changes, the Commission is not even known to most of the Negro community; people do not know that there is an agency to hear their grievances when they have them. The other agencies are less than powerless and cannot be expected to produce any results.

All of which is to say that no reform of police practices can be expected from within the department, or from any of the agencies which are supposed to have immediate jurisdiction in the problem. Nor do the piecemeal demonstrations seem to have any effect. And it seems as though Olsen's re-election and the conspiracy which exists between the police department, the prosecutor's office and the courts, outweigh the attempts of the NAACP to produce reform by working through the court system. This is not to say that the NAACP has not won impressive victories on individual cases, notably the Rembert-Tyson case. But there seems to be little or no impact from these victories on the general practice of policemen--they remain unaffected. There also seems to be little luck with civil suits against police officers.

A number of cities have tried to solve the problems of police harassment and brutality through police review boards. In nearly every city that this has been tried it has been a failure, at least in terms of improving relations between the police department and the Negro community. The two most glaring examples, of course, are Philadelphia and Rochester, both of which were the scenes of major riots during the summer of 1964, when review boards were already in operation.

Apparently, however, a number of reasons can be offered to explain these failures. In the first place, there is reason to believe that the Negro community in those cities, by and large, was either unaware of its existence or knew it existed but saw it as ineffective on one or both of the following counts: (1) it had no preventive impact on police behavior--police did not stop harassing and beating black citizens after the board went into operation; or (2) the board had proved ineffective in dealing with cases it did take up to the satisfaction of the Negro community and to the prevention of police brutality.

Most police review boards are appointed *by the people* by the mayor and are responsible to him. As such they are subject to all kinds of political pressures, pressures which originate outside the ghetto. Pressures similar to those which prevented the Detroit Commission on Community Relations from conducting a thorough investigation of the Cynthia Scott case, for example.

It would seem to follow, therefore, that the provisions below would be necessary in the formation of a successful police review board. (Successful meaning one which by nature makes police "think twice" about harassing anyone, and which can also act with real authority to discipline police who still do behave in a brutal or discriminatory manner.)

1. The board would have to have real power--power to discipline policemen in degrees up to and including dismissal.